



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,298	03/29/2001	Minoru Yamanaka	0828.65363	2115

7590 01/27/2005

Patrick G. Burns, Esq.
GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.
300 South Wacker Dr., Suite 2500
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/821,298

Applicant(s)

YAMANAKA ET AL.

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 10/12/04 to the application filed on 3/29/01.
2. Claim 3 is canceled.
3. Claims 1-2, 4-7 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, and 7 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-2, 4-7 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamigawa (US Pat No. 5,307,486, 4/26/94) in view of Culik, II, Dense Multiway Trees, ACM Transactions on Database Systems, vol.6, no.3, September 1981, pages 486-512.

Regarding independent claim 1, Nakamigawa discloses:

- storing information on an amount of available space in each of said plurality of nodes (**figures 2-3**: the pointer count in each node is the information indirectly showing the amount of space available in each node, for example, the pointer count in the node in figure 3 indicates that there are only three records A, B, C in the node and so said node has available space for two more records)
- acquiring an amount of available space in the first node and the second node based on said information stored in step (a), when a first data item is inserted into or deleted from the target node, said plurality of pages include the first node and the second node in a sequential arrangement of the plurality of nodes (**figure 4**: the pointer count (see fig. 2) in the target node with records A, C, D, E, F shows there is *zero available space* for inserting a record to the target node, the pointer count in the adjacent node with records G, H, I shows there are available space for two records; **col 3, lines 39-49, col 4, lines 15-28**:
determining if the pointer count of a target node after insertion is greater than M and determining if the pointer count of an adjacent node is less than M' imply that

the amount of available space of the first node and the second node is acquired based on the pointer count data)

- moving at least one second data item contained in said first node to said second node according to said amount of available space in each of said first and second nodes, before insertion of said first data item into said first node or after deletion of said first data item from said third page (**figure 4**: record F, equivalent to the second data item, is moved from the target node to the adjacent node, which is equivalent to the second node, since the adjacent node has some space available whereas the target node does not have any available space for inserting record B, which is equivalent to the first data item)
- wherein in the moving step, when both of said first and second pages have sufficient available space, said at least one second data item is moved to said second page (**figure 4**: the adjacent node has sufficient available space, and the record F equivalent to the second data item, is moved from the target node to the adjacent node, which is equivalent to the second page)

Nakamigawa does not disclose a method of data item managing as above is applied to a plurality of data items contained in a plurality of pages. Instead, Nakamigawa discloses a method *of data item managing for a plurality of data items contained in a plurality of nodes* (figures 2-5).

Culik discloses that each node in a B-tree corresponds to a page where insertion or deletion can be applied to the B-tree (pages 486-487), each node has the left and right brothers (page 487), and a node can be created (page 492).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporate Culik into Nakamigawa to show that managing of data items in the nodes in Nakamigawa can be applied to managing the data items in the pages, arranged in sequence in a document where the pages are equivalent to the nodes.

Nakamigawa also does not disclose the third page for inserting or deleting data items.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Culik into Nakamigawa to include a first page (or first node) for managing the data item in the sequential pages for the following reason.

In Nakamigawa, two nodes are mentioned: the target node and the adjacent node. The first data item is inserted into or deleted from the target node (equivalent to the third node of the invention) and the second data item is moved from the target node to the adjacent node (equivalent to the second node of the invention).

The claimed limitations, in a slightly difference, recite three pages, equivalent to three nodes, in which the first page, the third page, and the second page arranged in such a sequence where the insertion or deletion of the first data item occurs in the third page, and where the moving of the second data item contained in the third page to either the first page or the second page. It is easy to recognize that the target node of

Nakamigawa is equivalent to the third node, and that *the adjacent node of Nakamigawa is equivalent to either the first page or the second page of the claim* since the adjacent node is the one that the second data item is moved to. Also, it was obvious that the “adjacent node” of the target node means that the “adjacent node” can precede or follows the target node provided that it is adjacent to the target node. Further, as in

Culik, each node may have the left brother and the right brother, and it is possible to create a leaf node. Therefore, it is suggested adding a node equivalent to the first node to the sequence of the target node and the adjacent node since *the node added is merely a form of adjacent node* and for performing the same function as that of the first node or the second node of the invention.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Nakamigawa discloses that when said amount of said available space is equal to or less than a predetermined amount, said information indicates that substantially no available space exists (col 1, lines 25-45, col 2, lines 39-50, figures 2-4). As disclosed, **the pointer count increases 1 when a record is inserted in a node** (figures 2-3: the pointer count of the node in fig. 3 increases 1 when record B is inserted in said node). For a maximum size M of the records in one of the nodes, moving a number of records from the target node to the adjacent node happens if (a pointer count of a target node **after insertion**) > M, and (a pointer count of the adjacent node) < M (col 1, lines 25-45). The pointer count of a target node after insertion is greater than M where M represents the size of the target node (col 2, lines 39-50) **means that before the insertion a record, the pointer count of the target node must be equal to the amount M.** The moving a data item in the target node to the adjacent node occurs since either there is **not enough space** for inserting data in the target node or there is **no available space** in the target node for inserting data. In other words, the **information relating to the node size indicates that substantially no space available exists.**

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Nakamigawa discloses that said amount of the available space is classified into one of a plurality of ranges of amounts of the available space, and said information on the amount of the available space indicates one of the plurality of ranges (col 2, lines 39-50 and col 1, lines 25-62). As disclosed in Nakamigawa, the maximum size M is for storing the records in one of the nodes and size M' smaller than M is for storing the records in an adjacent node thereto, and an insert process of the records to one of the nodes is performed based on the sizes M and M' via checking the pointer count of the target node and the pointer count of the adjacent node for available space. The minimum size m is for storing the records in one of the nodes and size m' larger than m for storing the records in an adjacent node thereto, and a delete process of the records from one of the nodes is carried out based on the sizes of m and m' via checking the pointer count of the target node and the pointer count of the adjacent node for available space. The ranges of (M', M) and (m, m') are classified for available space for the insertion process and the deletion process. Therefore, the information of pointer count for deriving the available space in one of the nodes indicates one of the plurality of ranges, either the range for insertion or the range for deletion.

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Nakamigawa discloses that one of the plurality of ranges including the biggest amount of the available space is wider than the other of said plurality of ranges (col 2, lines 39-50: the range (M', M) includes the maximum size M for storing records in one of the nodes where M is used for checking

the available space of the target node and where range (M' , M) is wider than range (m , m').

Claims 6 and 7 are for a computer-readable storage medium and an apparatus of method claim 1, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/12/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that claims 1 and 7, as amended by including the limitations of claim 3, which is now canceled, are not disclosed in Nakamigawa and Culik. Applicants state that figure 4 of Nakamigawa does not disclose when both of said first and second pages have sufficient available space, said at least one second data item is moved to said second page but only disclose that after data B is inserted into a node, data F overflow moves to the next node (Remarks, page 6).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Figure 4 of Nakamigawa shows that data F, which is equivalent to the second data item, is moved to the second node, which is equivalent to the second page, before data B, which is equivalent to the first data item, is inserted into the target node. Moving of data F can not be performed *after inserting data B* as argued since there is no place for data B to be inserted in the first node if data F is not moved out first.

Since the references disclose the claimed limitations, and the amendment is merely canceling claim 3 and incorporating claim 3 limitations into claims 1 and 7, the claim rejections remain.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Jeyaraman (US Pat No. 6,311,187 B1, 10/30/01, filed 12/29/98).

Tenev et al. (US Pat No. 6,377,259 B2, 4/23/02, filed 7/29/98).

Vu et al. (US Pat No. 6,393,427 B1, 5/21/02, filed 3/22/99).

Pan et al. (US Pat No. 6,760,306 B1, 7/6/04, filed 9/27/00).

Tenev et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2001/0045952 A1, 11/29/01, filed 7/29/98).

Oyanagi et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2001/0051934 A1, 12/13/01, filed 3/13/01).

Lee et al. (US Pat App Pub No. 2003/0079157 A1, 4/24/03, filed 2/3/00).


Jang et al., An Effective Mechanism for Index Update in Structured Document, ACM
1999, pages 383-390.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4125.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Clh
1/10/05


CESAR B PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
AU 2178